DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 759 SO 014 438

AUTHOR Murdock, Margaret Maier
TITLE Ethnicity and Political Trust: Arapahoe and Shoshoni Children.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Denver, CO, September 2-5, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Elementary Education; *Ethnicity; *Federal Government; Federal Indian Relationship; Government Role; Political Attitudes; Political Socialization; Social Science Research; *State Government; *Student Attitudes; *Tribal Sovereignty
IDENTIFIERS Arapahoe (Tribe); Shoshone (Tribe); Trust

ABSTRACT

The relationship between ethnicity and political trust among American Indian elementary school children was determined for federal, state, and tribal levels. A total of 312 Arapahoe, Shoshoni, and white students were questioned to determine whether they thought each level of government could be trusted, whether the government cares about them and their families, and whether individuals have little to do with governmental activities. Ethnicity of the American Indian students was determined as high, low, or medium in accordance with the degree to which their native language was spoken in the home and their knowledge of religious tradition. American Indian children were less trusting than white children of federal and state governments, high levels of ethnicity producing lower levels of trust in federal and state governments and higher levels of trust in tribal government. Conversely, low levels of ethnicity produced higher levels of trust in federal and state government and lower levels of trust in tribal government. Children with medium ethnicity were the least trusting, regardless of the level of government. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Maier Murdock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ethnicity and Political Trust: Arapahoe and Shoshoni Children

Margaret Maier Murdock
University of Wyoming - Casper

SP 014 438

Prepared for delivery at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, The Denver Hilton Hotel, September 2-5, 1982. Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

ETHNICITY AND POLITICAL TRUST: ARAPAHOE AND SHOSHONI CHILDREN

I. INTRODUCTION

> . . . we must watch the infant in his mother's arms; we must see the first images which the external world casts upon the dark mirror of his mind, the first occurrences that he witnesses; we must hear the first words which awaken the sleeping powers of thought, and stand by his earliest efforts if we would understand the prejudices, the habits, and the passions which will rule his life. The entire man is, so to speak, to be seen in the cradle of the child.
> (De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, pp. 27-28).

Although social scientists are now less willing then de Tocqueville to assert with such forthright certitude that the prejudices, habits and passions which rule an adult's life are formed entirely when that adult is a child, we are still very conscious that vital and irreplaceable learning takes place during the impressionable childhood years. Such learning is important to every facet of our lives, as we begin to function in society. And while language, motor skills and social interaction may be vital and important skills for children to learn, we have also begun to recognize that children learn a great deal about political institutions, processes and authorities while they are still young. Because we still believe, with de Tocqueville, that childhood learning affects adult behavior, we have continued to be concerned with what children know about the political system, and their attitudes toward the political system.

This study of childhood political socialization focuses on one aspect of attitudes toward the political system, political trust. But it also focuses on the effects which ethnicity, the product of another socialization process, has on levels of political trust. The study begins with a discussion of the conceptualization and operationalization of the terms ethnicity and political trust, and then moves to an examination of the effects of ethnicity on levels of trust in the federal, state and tribal governments expressed by a group of American indian children.

II. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF TERMS

A. ETHNICITY

We have long been cognizant of differences among people as individuals and as groups, and we have been fascinated, perplexed and, often, disturbed by such differences. In fact, we often see the world beyond ourselves through a "we-they" dichotomy that changes as our wants and conditions change (Sartre, 1965). This dichotomized perception has been an aggregating influence, if not a cause, of some of the most violent and destructive events in human history (Toland, 1977), and seems destined to maintain the separation of groups for the foreseeable future as well.

The subject of ethnicity, which is one way of perceiving differences among people, has generated an ever-increasing volume of both empirical and theoretical literature (Barth, 1969; Greeley, 1971, 1974; Glazer and Moynihan, 1975; Hicks and Leis, 1977; Giles, 1977; Patterson, 1977; Weiser, 1978; Takaki, 1979), and it will continue to do so as long as anyone thinks that ethnic differences are of any importance. The answer to Greeley and McCready's question, "Does Ethnicity Matter?" (1974) seems unanimously to be yes, though students of ethnicity have had trouble deciding not only what it is about ethnicity that matters, but what, in fact, ethnicity is, how it can be defined, and how it can be operationalized (Greeley and McCready, 1974; Isajiw, 1974; Glazer and Moynihan, 1975; Dashefsky, 1975; Keyes, 1976; van den Berghe, 1976; Banks, 1978; Greeley and Jacobson, 1978; Sarna, 1978). Some trends in the conceptualization and operationalization of ethnicity have begun to emerge, however, and these trends serve as the basis for the focus of ethnicity employed in this discussion.

Two major difficulties plagued the early study of ethnicity. The first was clearly illustrated by Isajiw in his discussion of the definitions of ethnicity (1974). He noted that "very few researchers of ethnic relations ever define the meaning of ethnicity . . . . [of] 65 sociological and anthropological studies dealing with one or another aspect of ethnicity . . . 52 had no explicit definition at all". (1974:111). There were several reasons for this problem. Two were cited by Isajiw: "There is always the danger that any definition may be either too narrow and therefore inapplicable to the ethnic groups under study, or else too general and hence devoid of substantive meaning." (1974:111). It appears from a reading of material that dealt with the various aspects of ethnicity that ethnicity was thought in some way to be common knowledge, that everyone understood what ethnicity meant, so no explicit definitions were called for (Lavell, 1956).

The second major difficulty arose when researchers did try to define the concept of ethnicity, for the widely disparate definitions attributed to the concept of ethnicity vastly complicated an already confused area (Isajiw, 1974). The definitions were of two basic types, those that declared objective characteristics, such as language, physical characteristics or national descent (Gordon, 1964) as being the basis of ethnicity; and those that declared subjective characteristics, that is, a self-awareness of "being different", (Weber, 1968) as being most essential.

The dedicated work of individuals working on their own, and the emergence of forums such as Ethnicity have given some regularity and stability to the study of ethnicity, which in turn have contributed to much progress

in the understanding of ethnicity as a concept that can be utilized.

Both the objective and subjective perceptions of ethnicity are necessary, but alone neither is sufficient. Hence, it appears that the most useful approach to the elusive concept of ethnicity must include aspects of both the objective and subjective theories of ethnicity: ethnicity is in fact a combination of both factors (Sarna, 1978). The basis for this duality in the creation of the existence of what we call ethnicity lies in the psychological processes relating to the Other which Sartre described.

> The other is the one who is not me and the one who I am not. This not indicates a nothingness as a given element of separation between the Other and myself. Between the Other and myself there is a nothingness of separation. This nothingness does not derive its origin from myself nor from the Other, nor is it a reciprocal relation between the Other and myself. On the contrary, as a primary absence of relation, it is originally the foundation of all relation between the Other and me.
> (1953:312-13)

The implications of this distinction between the One and the Other as manifested on a group level have been discussed by Sartre in Anti-Semite and Jew (1965), where he delineates the "we-they" dichotomy which characterizes our group relations with the Other.

From this basic, individual, philosophical/psychological basis, we can extrapolate to group interrelations. There are two ways in which others are determined to be different: (1) "we" determine that "they" are different and (2) "they" determine that "they" themselves are different. This distinction was made by Horowitz (1975) in his terms "other definition" and "self-definition" of ethnic differences. When these two definitions, the self-definition of ethnic differences and the other-definition of ethnic differences, converge, then the process of "ethnicization" has taken place (Sarna, 1978:373): we can, then, validly discuss ethnicity. In order to accurately understand ethnicity, then, both the objective and subjective elements must be considered.

The operationalization of ethnicity can be accomplished only through both a thorough understanding of the theoretical elements of the concept and a knowledge of the history and culture of the group to be observed. The objective element of ethnicity is determined by things that can be seen or observed: physical characteristics, language, national descent. The subjective element of ethnicity is determined by those perceptions which individuals or groups have about themselves.

The objective element of ethnicity always seems to be the more easily determined: with some degree of accuracy, and with a moderate amount of effort, it is possible to determine if a person speaks a particular language as a "native" language, if a person's skin is a distinctive color, if he has physical characteristics associated with a particular group of people (e.g., Negroid, Oriental, Caucasian), or if a person's ancestors derived from a particular geographic or cultural area. The ease with which we have thought that we can determine these objective elements of ethnicity has certainly been a factor in the use of this element alone in determining ethnicity (Greenberg, 1969). The whole phenomenon of "passing", however, is just one factor which puts into question the total reliability of such a method of determining ethnicity. Another consideration that illustrates the unreliability of using this method alone is the number of people who do not "look" like a particular ethnic group, but who nonetheless identify

with the group. Thus, we must turn to the subjective characteristics in order to complement the objective and get a whole view of ethnicity.

The subjective element of ethnicity is not as easy to determine, or at least it has not been perceived as being easy to determine, and hence there has been either a difficulty in operationalizing this element, or a total ignoring of its importance. The understanding of the subjective dimension of ethnicity however, is greatly enhanced by making a further distinction within this general element: the subjective element of ethnicity can be divided into what may be termed "manifest" subjective ethnic identification and "latent" subjective ethnic identification (Murdock, 1978). Manifest subjective ethnic identification can be defined as that identification with a group that an individual consciously makes when forced to (Sartre, 1965). Such an identification is made by an individual when asked his ethnic background or, more subtly, when the individual is subjected to a pejorative discussion of his ethnic group. At such a juncture, an individual who might not otherwise think consciously of himself in ethnic terms seeks a defensive identification with the group in question. The identification does not have to be overtly expressed, and probably will not be if the cost of such an admission would outweigh the benefits (Sarna, 1974). Manifest subjective ethnicity can be determined by asking an individual to state what ethnic group he, or his parents belong to.

Latent subjective ethnic identification is that dimension of ethnicity which is most difficult to determine. It consists of those attitudes, values or patterns of behavior which an individual unconsciously engages in or adheres to regardless of negative or positive stimuli. Although the subjective dimension of ethnicity is characterized by the voluntariness discussed by Horowitz (1965), that voluntariness is often curtailed by a degree of consciousness which characterizes this latent identification: since the identification is largely unconscious, voluntariness of adherence may not even enter into the identification. In order to determine if an individual makes such a latent identification, it is necessary to determine what values, attitudes or patterns of behaviour characterize a particular group and then determine if the individual adheres to them to any substantial degree.

The operationalization of ethnicity in this study entailed a combination of both objective and subjective dimensions of the concept. The author, with the assistance of the teachers, made a visual, or objective, determination of whether the children were White, Chicano or American Indian. If they were determined to be American Indians, then there was an attempt to determine if they were Arapahoe or Shoshoni. This objective categorization was made on the basis of physical characteristics, especially facial characteristics, that allowed some accuracy of division according to broad categories and even a degree of accuracy in determining tribal membership. These distinctions were aided by school membership, which grouped Arapahoes predominantly in one school, Shoshonis in another, and Whites in a third, though there was no absolute division based on schools.

The latent subjective dimension of ethnicity was measured by asking the children how much of their tribe's language they spoke, asking them how much of the tribal language members of their families spoke, and also asking them to identify/define distincitve elements of their tribe's cultural traditions. Although language is usually viewed as an objective characteristic of ethnicity, with regard to American Indian tribal languages, language assumes both a subjective and objective dimension, because there is no new source of native language speakers, as might be the case with Chicanos in California who experience the influx of Spanish-speakers from Mexico. American Indian languages have been kept alive by members of the tribes, despite much pressure to do away with them (Beuf, 1977:20), and

thus language use constitutes an important and reliable variable in determining ethnicity for American Indians.

The focus of the present discussion is the effect which ethnicity has on political trust; therefore, it is imperative to examine the concept of political trust as well.

B. POLITICAL TRUST

An interest in the support which a political system enjoys is fundamental. As David Easton has noted, support is a "major summary variable linking a system to its environment." (1965:156) We also know that, without some minimal level of support, a system will not continue to function (Easton,1965:158). Following Easton's analysis, we can distinguish two kinds of support for a system -- specific and diffuse (1965:267) --and each of these kinds of support is manifested in either observable behaviors or attitudinal dispositions (Easton, 1965:159-61). While specific support has limited usefulness, diffuse support is always essential, for it "forms a reservoir of favorable attitudes or good will that helps members to accept or tolerate outputs to which they are opposed or the effect of which they see as damaging to their wants." (Easton, 1965:273). Hence, it is important to examine the levels of support, especially the diffuse support, which members of a system have. Such levels of support give some indication of the stability of the system.

Childhood political socializzation studies have focused primarily on the levels of support which children express toward their political systems, though there has also been some investigation into the level and kinds of political knowledge retained by children. While early studies emphasized the positive support which children in general have for political institutions, values and authorities (Hyman, 1959; Greenstein, 1965; Hess and Torney, 1967), it is commonplace now to assert that children are less supportive than they were even twenty years ago (Dawson, Prewitt and Dawson, 1977; Arterton, 1974; Hershey and Hill, 1975). To explain this change in attitudes, we have looked to the influence of television, the change in social values and patterns of behavior, or political events like the Vietnam War and Watergate. What is often obscured by the dedication with which we pursue this development in childhood political socialization patterns is the fact that large percentages of children are still largely supportive of political institutions, political values and political authorities. And it is this continuing support which should assume primary importance, for, despite the influences of cynical television programming, changing social mores and demoralizing political events, not only has the American political system survived and remained functional, but the system seems to be producing children that continue to be largely supportive.

Trust is a vital element of the diffuse support which every political system must command in order to survive. Political trust is defined variably as the lack of political cynicism (Garcia, 1973:114) and as respect for political authorrities, institutions or norms (Andrain, 1971: 45). Political trust is an expression not only of governmental legitimacy, but also a belief in the capabilities of the political system. Respect for the elements of the political system may produce enough support and obedience that the political system may undertake unpleasant or unpopular policies without fear of undue instability.

While every system needs, and demands, some degree of trust, most studies of political attitudes have found that trust in government tends to diminish as a person grows older (Andrain, 1971:105; Jennings, 1968:

463). Studies of childhood political socialization among minority groups have revealed that children from low socio-economic backgrounds, ethnic and racial minority groups and isolated rural areas tend to have lower levels of political trust at even the youngest levels, than is the case for the White, middle-class, urban children who were most likely to be the subjects of early socialization studies (Jaros, Hirsh and Fleron, 1968; Greenberg, 1969; Lyons, 1970).

The levels of political trust held by the children in this study were measured by constructing a measure of trust and cynicism questions that focused on specific levels of government: federal, state and tribal. These questions asked the children if they trusted these governmental entities, if they thought what happened in these governmental units would happen no matter what people did, and if they thought thse governmental entities cared about them. In this way, not only ws it possible to determine the children's levels of trust toward each level of government, but also to compare the levels of trust which they exhibited for the federal, state and tribal governments.

An investigation into political trust presents more than mere academic interest, however, for political trust has been found to be higly related to political participation: "Political cynicism (or the lack of trust) and its converse, trust, have been found to be highly related to political participation. If a person feels distrust of public officials, it is likely to decrease political interest and participation." (Garcia, 1973: 114). Thus, determining the level of a child's political trust might be instructive in an attempt to help predict adult political behavior and its effect on the political system.

III. HYPOTHESES

Previous studies of childhood political socialization have noted that minority children tend to be less positive and supportive than White children in their attitudes toward government (Greenberg, 1969; Jaros, Hirsch and Fleron, 1968; Hirsch, 1971). These studies have also emphasized the fact that minority children tend to lose some of their supportive attitudes toward governmental institutions, processes and authorities at a faster rate than is the case among White children, so that by the eighth or ninth grade the minority children are much less positive in their political attitudes than Whites. Some maintain that this rapid decline in support is a reflection of minority children's growing realization that their position in the political economic and social environment is at a marked disadvantage compared to the position of Whites in the society (Garcia, 1973:186).

Like other minority children, American Indian children find themselves in a less advantageous position in the political system than White children. Both the historic and contemporary position of American Indians (including the Arapahoe and Shoshoni studied here) is less than favorable, when compared with that of White society. For generations the White culture in the United States has tried to exterminate, change, or at least hide American Indians (Cahn, 1969; Trenholm, 1970; Trenholm and Carley, 1964). Any moves to understand American Indian cultures, political processes and economic structures have been slow and halting, even reluctant and, largely, academic (Thorton and Grasmick, 1979). Today, American Indians hold little political or social power in American society, and economically most American Indians fall well below the average (Beuf, 1977; U.S. Government, 1981).

Unlike other minority children, however, American Indian children hold a unique relationship with the federal government. The trustee relationship which exists between the federally-recognized tribes and the United States government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) of the Department of Interior gives the federal government more direct influence over these children's lives than is the case for any other group of American children (Taylor, 1974). This relationship has not always operated for the benefit of the American Indians involved, so there is a strong historical experiential basis for non-supportive political attitudes among American Indians (Trenholm, 1970; Trenholm and Carley, 1964).

Finally, American Indian children face a governmental entity which does not exist for White children, and that is the tribal government. Tribal governments control most political intereactions on their reservations, but the tribes themselves also serve as cultural, social and familial units as well. The tribal governmental situation on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, where this study was undertaken, is furthr complicated by the fact that two separate tribes, the Arapahoe and the Shoshoni, historic enemies (Trenholm and Carley, 1964:22), were placed on the same reservation in the nineteenth century. Even today the tribes remain largely separate, with tribal councilmen and a tribal chairman being elected from each tribe as representatives on the Joint Tribal Council.

Based on the historic relationship between White society and American Indian tribes, results from previous childhood political socialization studies and the proximity and familiarity which should be enjoyed by a tribal government, two hypotheses concerning the effects of ethnicity on political trust, as manifested by Arapahoe and Shoshoni children, were formulated:

(1) The American Indian children with higher levels of ethnicity would be more trusting of the tribal government than of the White-dominated federal and state governments.
(2) The American Indian children with lower levels of ethnicity would be more trusting of the federal and state governments than of the tribal government.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Two considerations were given careful thought when this study was initiated. First, the fact that the subjects were children made careful construction and presentation of the questions vital. Children often do not perceive concepts or translate words into images in the same way that adults do (Donaldson, 1978). Therefore, it was important for the questions to be as simple as possible to avoid confusion and misinterpretation and to make sure that the children were answering the questions that we thought we were asking. For example, rather than asking the children questions about government in general, we asked them questions about specific levels of government: federal, state and tribal.

Second, the fact that these particular children were American Indians made a thoughtful consideration of the language and concepts utilized imperative, for these children had been socialized by American Indian as well as White agents, and therefore they might hold different perceptions of certain concepts or words. For example, the word "nation" was not

used in any of the questions, in order to avoid any confusion which these children might have with the United States as a nation and their tribes as nations.

With these considerations in mind, this study was conducted in four of the six schools on the Wind River Reservation in the Fall of 1976. The children ranged in age from the third to the eighth grades and they were predominately American Indian, though about a third of the sample was composed of White children who attended these reservation schools. Most of the American Indian children were from the Arapahoe tribe or the Shoshoni tribe. Table 1 shows the number of Arapahoe, Shoshoni and White children in this study, by grade level.

A sizeable group of children, about 60 in number, termed themselves as "Shoraps." These children had one parent from the Arapahoe tribe and one from the Shoshoni tribe. Because of the difficulties presented with regard to ethnicity by such a mixed tribal heritage, these children were excluded from the analysis for the present discussion.

The sample utilized for this study was not random, since as many children as were available in the schools to which we were granted access were interviewed. The total number of students interviewed, about four hundred and twenty-five, constituted more than half of all the students in these grades in all the schools on the reservation. First and second grade children were not interviewed because they tend to have considerable difficulty in understanding even the simple concepts employed in such a study.

Table 1

Number of Children in the Wind River Study
by Ethnic Group and Grade

Grade	Arapahoe	Shoshoni	White	Total
3	4	25	16	45
4	21	21	23	65
5	8	12	25	45
6	7	19	25	51
7	9	20	23	52
8	16	14	24	54
Total	65	111	136	312

The questions were read by the author to all the children in all the grades, in order to avoid any procedural differences that might affect responses, and to avoid any difficulties presented by a lack of reading skills. The children marked their answers to each question on their individual copies of the questionnaire. Although a large number of items were included on the whole questionnaire, the present discussion will focus only on those questions which deal with political trust and ethnicity.

The questions which comprised the measure of political trust were (1) Do you think the United States government can be trusted? (2) Do you think the United States government cares about you or your family? and (3) Some people say that what happens in the Unites States government will happen no matter what people do. They say it is like the weather, there is nothing people can do about it. Do you agree or disagree? These questions tapped both the trust and the cynicism elements in this attitude toward government. The same questions were asked of the children about

the Wyoming state government and the Tribal Council government in order to measure trust of these political systems and to compare trust toward different levels of government. High trust was reflected in positive answers to the first two questions, combined with a negative answer to the third question. All other response combinations were deemed to reflect a lesser level of trust, and were labelled as low trust.

The objective element of ethnicity was determined by a combination of observer and child tribal identification. The objective element is reflected in the following discussion by the general categorization of tribe name and the subjective element of ethnicity is reflected in the level of ethnic identification. Three questions comprised the ethnicity scale. These questions of necessity had to be different for the Arapahoe and the Shoshoni children, since they have different cultural heritages. These questions tapped the manifest and latent subjective elements of ethnicity. The questions used for the Arapahoe children were (1) How much Arapahoe do you speak? (2) Does anyone in your family speak Arapahoe? and (3) What is the Flat Pipe? Questions used for the Shoshoni children were (1) How much Shoshoni do you speak? (2) Does anyone in your family speak shoshoni? and (3) What do yoou think the Sun Dance is for? The question about the Flat Pipe measured knowledge of an Arapahoe religious object; the question about the Sun Dance measured knowledge of a Shoshoni religious tradition.

These questions were used to construct a Guttman scale. Those children who spoke a lot of their tribal language, whose families also spoke the tribal language and who could correctly identify an outstanding element of their tribal cultural tradition were labelled as having a high level of ethnicity. Those children who spoke little or none of their tribal language, whose families did not speak the tribal language, and who could not identify a salient traditional cultural element of their tribe were labelled as having a low level of ethnicity. Those children with mixed response patterns were labelled as having medium levels of ethnicity.

Once the analysis for ethnicity levels ws completed, the children were considered according to their level of ethnicity rather than their tribal heritage. These categorizations were then utilized in determining levels of political trust. In this way, then, the effects of ethnicity on political trust were determined.

V. RESULTS

A. GOVERNMENTAL TRUST

In the summer of 1863 the United States Government signed a treaty with the Shoshoni at Box Elder, in the Utah Territory (U.S. Government, 1863). The land reserved to the Shoshoni by this treaty lies in the region where the Wind River Reservation is today. Fourteen years later, the federal government was still assuring the Shoshoni that the Arapahoe would not be placed on their reservation (Trenholm, 1976). In 1877, however, the Arapahoe were temporarily settled on a portion of land which had been reserved for the Shoshoni. Not until 1935, however, did Congress pass an enabling act which allowed the Shoshoni to sue the United States Government for the lossess they sustained from the settlement of the Arapahoe on their land. The Shoshoni won their suit, but the decision included a provision that the award of several million dollars be decreased by the amount which the federal government had spent for improvements on

the Wind River Reservation. Several years prior to the settlement of the Arapahoe on the Wind River Reservation President William Henry Harrison had presented a silver saddle to the famous Shoshoni leader, Washakie, in appreciation for his asistance in saving a company of cavalry from ambush. On the list of improvements to the Wind River Reservation by which the United States Government sought to reduce the award granted to the Shoshoni in 1935 was the cost of the silver saddle given to Washakie. This act of the federal government, still remembered today, gave bitter meaning to the term "Indian-giver" among the Shoshoni. An "Indian-giver" was one who gave to an American Indian, then took away the gift (Trenholm, 1976).

The Arapahoe were on much less friendly terms with the Whites than were the Shoshoni under Washakie (Shakespeare, 1971:80-86). By the 1870's, however, the strength of the Arapahoe had been drained and only 938 Arapahoe, mostly women, without food and with no means to provide it, moved toward Fort Washakie to be placed on a reservation. The federal government had hunted the Arapahoe over much time and territory, reducing them to this decimated condition. The Arapahoe maintained that the Shoshoni helped the United States Army to track them down (Trenholm, 1973), destroying the last strength of their pride and forcing them to sue for peace under any terms (Shakespeare, 1971:90). Thus, it was with great bitterness toward both the United States Government and their traditional enemies the Shoshoni, that the Arapahoe were settled on a portion of the Wind River Reservation.

These two still-remembered events in the history of the Arapahoe and the Shoshoni tribes would certainly lead one to assume that the children of these tribes might not be especially enthusiastic in their support of the federal government. Thus, we hypothesized that the American Indian children with high levels of ethnicity would be less trusting of the federal and state governments, which are dominated by Whites, than they would be of their tribal government. Those American Indian children with lower levels of ethnicity are not as well-socialized into their tribal norms and values, so it was hypothesized that they would be more trusting of the federal and state governments than of the tribal government.

As a baseline for comparison, it is instructive to examine initially the difference between the American Indian children and the White children in the sample with regard to trust for the federal, state and tribal governments. Table 2 shows the differences between these two groups of children.

Table 2

Levels of Trust Expressed by American Indian and White Children Toward the United States Government, the Wyoming State Government and the Tribal Council Government

	United States Government		Wyoming Government		Tribal Government	
	High Trust	Low Trust	High Trust	Low Trust	High Trust	Low Trust
American Indian Children N=176	33.0	67.0	35.2	64.8	52.3	47.7
White Children N=136	55.1	44.9	60.3	39.7	39.7	60.3

It is clear from the response patterns in Table 2 that the White children were much more trusting of the federal and state governments than of the tribal government. It is also clear that the American Indian children were more trusting than the White children of the tribal government. Finally, it is obvious as well that the American Indian children were more trusting of the tribal government than of the federal and state governments.

Such results are predictable, both from the historic interactions of these tribes with particularly the federal government, and from previous studies which showed minority children to be less supportive and trusting of the federal government than White children. The initial pattern, then, is clear. The question which is presented is how ethnicity affects levels of political trust.

B. THE EFFECTS OF ETHNICITY ON POLITICAL TRUST

The hypothesis that high levels of ethnicity would adversely affect political trust in federal and state government and increase trust in tribal government would lead one to assume that the basic differences between American indian and White children exhibited above would be exaggerated when introducing the element of ethnicity. Table 3 reflects the levels of trust for the federal government exhibited by the American Indian children, by their level of ethnicity.

Table 3

Levels of Trust in the United States Government Expressed by American Indian Children, by Levels of Ethnicity

Level of Trust	Level of Ethnicity		
	High N=64	Medium N=68	Low N=44
High	31.3	25.0	47.7
Low	68.8	75.0	52.3

$X^2 = .0412$

Table 3 shows that the American Indian children with high levels of ethnicity were much less likely to trust the United States Government than are the children with low levels of ethnicity. The children with high levels of ethnicity were slightly less likely than the American Indian children as a whole to trust the federal government, while those children with low levels of ethnicity were much more likely than the whole group of American Indian children to trust this governmental entity. The group of children with a medium level of ethnicity, however, appeared to be the least likely of any of the American Indian children to exhibit a sense of trust in the United States Government.

The same trend appeared to hold true for levels of trust in the Wyoming

state government. Table 4 shows that the children with medium levels of ethnicity were least likely of all the American indian children to trust the state government, though the children with the highest levels of ethnicity were not far behind. The children with the lowest levels of ethnicity were, as in the case for the federal government, most likely to trust the state government. The children with medium and high ethnicity levels, however, were slightly more willing to express trust in the state government than in the federal government.

Table 4

Levels of Trust in the Wyoming State Government Expressed by American Indian Children by Levels of Ethnicity

Level of Trust	Level of Ethnicity		
	High N=64	Medium N=68	Low N=44
High	34.4	27.9	47.7
Low	65.6	72.1	52.3

X^2 = .0995

The effects of ethnicity are shown above with regard to trust in the federal and state governments, with the children with high levels of ethnicity being less likely than the children with the lowest levels of ethnicity to be trusting of these levels of government. Ethnicity has an even more marked effect on levels of trust for the tribal government, as Table 5 illustrates.

Table 5

Levels of Trust in the Tribal Council Government Expressed by American Indian Children, by Levels of Ethnicity

Level of Trust	Level of Ethnicity		
	High N=64	Medium N=68	Low N=44
High	64.1	41.2	52.3
Low	35.9	58.8	47.7

X^2 = .0314

It appeared that the children with high ethnicity were much more likely than the whole group of American Indian children to have a high level of trust in the tribal government. The same percentage of children in the low ethnicity group expressed high levels of trust in the tribal government as was the case for the American Indian children as a group, and it was the children with medium levels of ethnicity that were less likely than the whole group to express high trust in the tribal government. Not only were the children with high ethnicity much more likely than either the medium or low ethnicity groups of children to express high levels of trust in the tribal government, but these children were also much more likely to express trust in the tribal government than in either the state or the federal government. While the children with low ethnicity were less likely than the highly ethnic children to express high trust in the tribal government, still more than half of this group of children did have a high trust for the tribal government. The children with medium levels of ethnicity were, interestingly enough, least likely of all the children to express high levels of trust in the tribal government, although they were much more willing to trust the tribal government, apparently, than they were to trust either the state or the federal governments. The children with the low levels of ethnicity, contrary to our hypothesis, were also slightly more likely to express high levels of trust in the tribal government than in the federal or state governments.

VI. DISCUSSION

A. RESPONSE PATTERN TRENDS

Several trends appeared from the response patterns of the American Indian children on measures of political trust. First, the American Indian children were less trusting than White children of federal and state governments. The differences between the two groups of children in their trust of these levels of government were marked: while only about one-third of the American Indian children expressed high levels of trust, between 55% and 60% of the White children had high levels of trust for the Wyoming and United States governments. Second, the American Indian children were more willing than the White children to express a high degree of trust in the tribal government: more than half of the American Indian children had high trust in this governmental entity, but less than 40% of the White children expressed high trust in the tribal government. The fact that the tribal council government enjoyed some support from White children, however, is also reflected in these responses. If almost 40% of the White children had a high level of trust in the tribal government, despite the fact that the White children are less trusting than the American indian children of the tribal government, one could still assume that many of the White children have a degree of support for the tribal government. While this subject is beyond the scope of the present discussion, such a finding should prove to be a valuable focus for further inquiry.

A third trend discernible from the children's responses is the general effect of ethnicity on political trust. The effect which ethnicity has on political trust has several facets. First, high levels of ethnicity seem to produce lower levels of trust in federal and state governments and higher levels of trust in tribal government. Second, low levels of ethnicity seem to produce higher levels of trust in federal and state government and lower levels of trust in tribal government. Third, and most perplexing, is the effect of a medium level of ethnicity. Those children with medium

levels of ethnicity seemed to be the least trusting of all the children, regardless of the level of government. These children with medium levels of ethnicity were much more willing to express high levels of trust in the tribal government than in either the federal or state governments, but only 41% of the children with medium ethnicity levels expressed high trust in even the tribal government. Only about one-quarter of this group of children was willing to express high trust in the other two levels of government. Fourth, ethnicity did not seem to affect trust of tribal government among the children with the lowest levels of ethnicity in the expected manner. Even the children with low levels of ethnicity were more willing to express high trust in the tribal government than in either the federal or state governments.

Neither age nor sex have any discernible pattern of effect on the effects of ethnicity on political trust. A partial correlation procedure ran on the effects of the variables of sex and age showed no significant influence. Controlling for age and sex in a simple cross tabulation showed that children of different ages tended to respond differently, but there was no pattern at all to their response differences. They may have exhibited low trust in the third grade, high trust in the fourth and fifth grades, mediocre trust in the sixth and so on. The same kind of eclectic response patterns were revealed when controlling for sex. It seems, therefore, that ethnicity itself does indeed have the effect on political trust discussed above.

B. CAUSES AND IMPLICATIONS

The trends in the levels of trust expressed by the American Indian children are interesting, but two questions remain. First, what causes such patterns of trust, and second, what do these patterns mean?

1. Causes

The brief discussions of Arapahoe and Shoshoni history and the references to the nanture of the historical interactions between Whites and American Indians provide strong indications of why the American Indian children in this sample responded the way they did on measures of trust for the federal, state and tribal governments. A fuller examination of history, combined with a view of the contemporary relations beteen Whites and American Indians provides the fullest explanation for the response patterns of political trust encountered here. It becomes quite clear from such an examination that not only have the White-dominated governmental units acted in less than trustworthy ways, but that the consequences of these actions are a reality for American Indians in their political, economic and social lives.

First, except for the tribal governments, all other levels of government — federal, state and local — are, and have always been, dominated by Whites. This fact is impressed upon children not only in their own personal experiences, but also by the media, which seldom even portrays American Indians except in simplistic or romanticized fictional roles, or when American Indians have engaged in some type of political protest (Beuf, 1977:8).

Second, American Indians in general tend to be at a disadvantage in White economic society. The Arapahoe and Shoshoni provide no exception to this tendency. The Superintendent of the Wind River Reservation reported in April of 1981 that 53.1% of the American Indians on and around the Reservation were unemployed. This rate of unemployment among American

Indians compared with the 3-4% overall unemployment rate for the rest of Wyoming at that time. Additionally, almost 40% of the American Indian population on the Wind River Reservation received less than $5,000 in annual income (U.S. Government, 1981).

Finally, it is painfully evident from both readings and personal discussions that socially American Indians are not considered to be on the same social status level as Whites. American indians are often perceived in the least favorable manner by Whites and are often treated according to these unfavorable perceptions (Braroe, 1975:87-120).

2. Implications

Elsewhere I have documented the high levels of attachment which these same American Indian children have expressed for expecially the federal government (Murdock, forthcoming). Therefore it would seem that should their lack of trust continue into their adult political roles, these children would still continue to be supportive and therefore not present a major obstacle to the stability of the extant political system. However, high levels of attachment and low levels of trust in juxtaposition are a significant combination for adult political roles. The implications of such a combination of political attitudes would seem to portend a group of adults that supports the political system, but are not satisfied with either the allocation of resources or the methods of allocation. Put simply, these children may be both sophisticated and discerning in their approach to political systems in their adult political roles: they will support the system, but they will not be easily fooled or manipulated.

REFERENCES

ANDRAIN, Charles F. (1971) Children and Civic Awareness. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

ARTERTON, F. Christopher (1974) "The Impact of Watergate on Children's Attitudes Toward Political Authority." Political Science Quarterly June:269-288.

BANKS, James A. and GAY, Geneva (1978) "Ethnicity in Contemporary American Society: Toward the Development of a Typology." Ethnicity. Volume 5:238-251.

BARTH, Fredrik A., ed. (1969) Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little Brown and Company

BEUF, Ann (1977) Red Children in White America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

BRAROE, Niels Winther (1975) Indian and White: Self-Image and Interaction in a Canadian Plains Community. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

CAHN, Edgar S., ed. (1969) Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America. New York: New Community Press.

DASHEFSKY, Arnold (1975) "Theoretical Frameworks in the Study of Ethnic Identity: Toward a Social Psychology of Ethnicity." Ethnicity. Volume 2:10-18.

DAWSON, Richard E., PREWITT, Kenneth and DAWSON, Karen S. (1977). Political Socialization. Second Edition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

DONALDSON, Margaret (1978) Children's Minds. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

EASTON, David (1965) A System's Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

GARCIA, F. Chris (1973) Political Socialization of Chicano Children: A Comparative Study with Anglos in California Schools. New York: Praeger Publishers.

GILES, Howard (1977) Languange, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations. New York: Academic Press.

GLAZER, Nathan and MOYNIHAN, Daniel P., eds. (1975) Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

GORDON, Milton M. (1964) Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

GREELEY, Andrew M. (1971) Why Can't They Be Like Us? New York: E. P. Dutton and Company.

—— (1974) Ethnicity in the United States. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

—— and McCREADY, William C. (1974) "Does Ethnicity Matter?" Ethnicity. Volume 1:91-108.

——and JACOBSEN, Christian Wells (1978) "Editorial Research Note." Ethnicity. Volume 5:1-13.

GREENBERG, Edward S. (1969) "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Comparison of Black andd White Children." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Wisconsin.

GREENSTEIN, Fred S. (1965) Children and Politics. New Haven: Yale University Press.

HERSHEY, Majorie Randon and HILL, David B. (1975) "Watergate and Preadults' Attitudes Toward the President." American Journal of Political Science. November:703-706.

HESS, Robert and TORNEY, Judith V. (1967) The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

HICKS, George L. and LEIS, Philip E., eds. (1977) Ethnic Encounters: Identities and Contexts. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.

HIRSCH, Herbert (1971) Poverty and Politicization: Political Socialization in an American Subculture. New York: The Free Press.

HOROWITZ, Donald L. (1975) "Ethnic Identity." Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

HYMAN, Herman (1959) Political Socialization. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

ISAJIW, Wsevolod W. (1974) "Definitions of Ethnicity." Ethnicity. Volume 1:111-124.

JAROS, Dean (1966) "Children's Orientations Toward Political Authority: A Detroit Study." Ph.D. Dissertation. Vanderbilt University.

——, HIRSCH, Herbert and FLERON, Frederic J., Jr. (1968) "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture." American Political Science Review. Volume 62:564-75.

JENNINGS, Kent M. and NIEMI, Richard G. (1968) "Patterns of Political Learning." Harvard Educational Review. (Summary). Volume 38:443-67.

KEYES, Charles F. (1976) "Towards a New Formulation of the Concept of Ethnic Group." Ethnicity. Volume 3:202-213.

LAVELL, Carr B. (1956) "Needed Research in the Demographic and Sociological Aspects of Immigration." A Report on World Polulation Migrations. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Press.

LYONS, Schuley (1970) "The Political Socialization of Ghetto Children: Efficacy and Cynicism." Journal of Politics. Volume 32:288-304.

MURDOCK, Margaret Maier (1978) "The Political Attitudes of Native American Children: The Arapahoe and Shoshoni of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming." Ph.D. Dissertation. Tufts University.

----(forthcoming) "Political Attachment Among Native Americans: Arapahoe and Shoshoni Children and the National Political System." Social Science Journal.

PATTERSON, Orlando (1977) Ethnic Chauvinism. New York: Stein and Day.

SARNA, Jonathan D. (1978) "From Immigrants to Ethnics: Toward a New Theory of 'Ethnicization'." Ethnicity. Volume 5:370-378.

SARTRE, Jean-Paul (1965) Anti-Semite and Jew. New York: Schocken Books.

----(1966) Being and Nothingness. New York: Washington Square Press.

SHAKESPEARE, Tom (1971) The Sky People. New York: Vantage Press.

TAKAKI, Ronald (1979) Iron Cages. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

TAYLOR, Theodore W. (1974) "American Indians and Their Governments." Current History. Volume 67 (December):254-77.

THORNTON, Russell and GRASMICK, Mary K. (1979) "Sociological Study of American Indians: A Research Note on Journal Literature." Ethnicity. Volume 6:299-305.

TRENHOLM, Virginia Cole (1970) The Arapahoes, Our People. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

---- and CARLEY, Maurine (1964) The Shoshonis, Sentinels of the Rockies. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

U.S. GOVERNMENT (1981) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Report of the Superintendent of the Wind River Reservation.

VAN DEN BERGHE, Pierre L. (1976) "Ethnic Pluralism in Industrial Societies: A Special Case?" Ethnicity. Volume 3:242-255

WEBER, Max (1968) Economy and Society. New York: Bedminster Press. Volume 1. Chapter 5:389.

WEISER, Marjorie P. K., ed (1978) Ethnic America. New York: H.W. Wilson Co.